

CA1
YL15
- P52

Political change north of 60°

CA1
YL15
-P52

Current Issue Review

88-3E

POLITICAL CHANGE NORTH OF 60°

Jack Stilborn
Political and Social Affairs Division

22 April 1988
Revised 13 April 1993



Library of
Parliament
Bibliothèque
du Parlement

**Research
Branch**

The Research Branch of the Library of Parliament works exclusively for Parliament, conducting research and providing information for Committees and Members of the Senate and the House of Commons. This service is extended without partisan bias in such forms as Reports, Background Papers and Issue Reviews. Research Officers in the Branch are also available for personal consultation in their respective fields of expertise.

©Minister of Supply and Services Canada 1993
Available in Canada through
your local bookseller
or by mail from
Canada Communication Group -- Publishing
Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9

Catalogue No. YM32-1/88-3-1993-04E
ISBN 0-660-15234-7

N.B. Any substantive changes in this publication which have been made since the preceding issue are indicated in **bold print**.

CE DOCUMENT EST AUSSI
PUBLIÉ EN FRANÇAIS



CANADA

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT
BIBLIOTHÈQUE DU PARLEMENT

POLITICAL CHANGE NORTH OF 60°

ISSUE DEFINITION

The Yukon and Northwest Territories have been undergoing considerable political changes in recent years. Governmental and administrative processes have been transformed, and the question of evolution towards provincial status is now frequently raised. This issue attracted particular attention in the wake of the provisions of the 1987 Meech Lake Constitutional Accord concerning the creation of new provinces. The possibility of dividing the Northwest Territories between east and west into the native homelands of Nunavut and Denendeh has also been a focus of concern. The current agenda of political change is inextricably linked to the economic development of the north, the settlement of aboriginal land claims and the establishment of self-government, though space permits only brief mention of those issues in this review.

BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

The Yukon was established as a separate territory in 1898, with an appointed commissioner and a six-member council of advisers, who were also appointed. Elected members were gradually included; all Yukon council members were elected by 1908. The commissioner, council, and territorial administration were located in the Yukon, and provincial status was seen as imminent. With the collapse of the Klondike boom, however, the Yukon population declined sharply and, by the end of World War I, the territory was almost completely run by the commissioner appointed by the federal government.

The original Northwest Territories included the present N.W.T. as well as what are now the Yukon, Alberta and Saskatchewan. They had a fully-elected assembly in 1881 and

responsible government from 1897. In 1905, however, when the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan were created, the rest of the N.W.T. returned to colonial status, being ruled by a commissioner and public servants residing in Ottawa. A six-member council was appointed in 1921 to advise the commissioner, but its members also lived in Ottawa. Absentee rule continued until 1951 when the first session of the territorial council was held in the north with elected members from the Mackenzie Valley area. The first three eastern Arctic ridings were created in 1966. In 1965, the "Carrothers Commission," an Advisory Commission on the Development of Government in the N.W.T., was established. As a result of its recommendations, the territorial council was increased in 1967 to 16 members, some elected and some appointed, and the territorial government was moved to Yellowknife. The N.W.T. had its first fully-elected legislative assembly in 1975.

The formal constitutional status of both territories in relation to the federal government is similar to that of municipalities in relation to provincial governments. In reality, however, they now have considerable autonomy and are closer to *de facto* responsible government. In 1979, the Honourable Jake Epp, then Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, instructed the Yukon Commissioner to appoint a Cabinet on the advice of the Government Leader, to accept its advice and not to participate in Cabinet. Since then, the Commissioner has functioned in effect like a lieutenant-governor. At almost the same time, in the 1978 elections, party politics was introduced in the Yukon; independents won only two of 16 seats in 1978, one in 1982, and none in 1985. The Executive Council is now selected strictly on a party basis and operates as though the assembly had the same power to vote non-confidence in the government as a provincial legislature. In October 1989, the Yukon cabinet took the further symbolic step of giving the title of "Premier" to Government Leader Tony Penikett. Ottawa is reviewing this move, which it has the authority to reverse.

The N.W.T. Legislative Assembly has also progressed towards responsible government, though less rapidly than that of the Yukon. The territorial commissioner now plays the "lieutenant-governor" role of the Yukon commissioner. In October 1989, Dan Morris, a Métis from Inuvik, was sworn in as the N.W.T.'s first native Commissioner. Administrative portfolios rest in the hands of the members of the Executive Council, whom the elected members of the assembly choose from among themselves. An important obstacle to full responsible

government in the N.W.T. Legislative Assembly is the absence of a party system. The assembly operates through what has been termed "consensus government," though "non-partisan" government may be a more accurate phrase. There is no collective responsibility of the executive and no clear procedure for voting non-confidence in the government, though individual executive members can be dismissed by vote of the assembly. On specific issues, however, there are often clear lines of division: between eastern arctic and western arctic or native and non-native. In addition, many MLAs are identified with, and active in, political parties at the federal level, so it seems probable that territorial elections will eventually be fought on party lines.

The territories have evolved administratively as well. Their governments now have responsibility for program delivery in social services, small-business development, education, tourism, and most development of renewable resources. Non-renewable resource development and land-use planning, however, remain in the control of the federal government. Federal grants and transfers account for approximately 60% of the Yukon budget and 80% of the budget of the N.W.T., but much of the program administration is local. The Yukon bureaucracy is very similar to that of a provincial government but the N.W.T. bureaucracy differs: it is highly decentralized, in recognition of the vast territory which must be administered, and it has a policy of "indigenization" of the public service.

Political development, and the social and economic development which subsumes it, continue to be pursued by both territorial and federal governments. For example, in the Yukon, the NDP government led by Tony Penikett undertook an extensive consultation process during 1988 with an emphasis on involvement of communities and social sectors in economic development and renewal. The final report, *Yukon 2000*, was released in April 1988 and focused attention on links between various sectors of the economy and specific principles to guide social and economic development of the territory. It also reported on the government's actions and plans for economic development. These community-based plans, to the extent that they encourage future economic progress, could also further stimulate the development of a base for further political change in the Yukon.

At the federal level, on 2 August 1988, the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development released its own report, "A Northern Political and Economic Framework." The primary goals established in the policy framework are: developing fully

responsible northern governments through the transfer of federal programs to the territorial governments; settling native land claims in the north; promoting economic development; and enhancing Canadian sovereignty in the north. The opportunities for and obstacles to fulfilling this ambitious agenda were discussed at the 11th National Northern Development Conference held in Edmonton in October 1988.

Future political development in the north involves several critical processes of evolution: the efforts to achieve a division of the N.W.T. into eastern and western arctic political jurisdictions, and progress towards either provincial status or some other less "colonial" formal governmental structure than that which currently obtains in the territories. These processes are inextricably linked to the ongoing negotiations over land claims and aboriginal self-government. These three issues are dealt with separately in what follows.

A. Aboriginal Claims

Although the federal and territorial governments are committed to the process of devolution, it is clear that the outcome of aboriginal self-government negotiations and land claims settlements will crucially affect the nature and timing of future development in the North. The self-government issue by itself may well determine the constitutional status of the territories, especially the N.W.T., for many years to come. Settlement of the political rights of native peoples could either provoke insistent demands for provincial status, especially in the eastern arctic, or render that issue irrelevant. Decisions on land will include decisions on resource control, which will dramatically affect both the direction of future economic development and the question of who benefits from it. Financial settlements will affect the viability not just of native communities but also of potential provinces or regional authorities. It should also be noted that the various claims by the Council of Yukon Indians in the Yukon and the Inuvialuit (western arctic Inuit), Dene, Métis and Inuit in the N.W.T., come from quite different visions of the future for their societies, economies and politics. Negotiations have been deadlocked for some time on the issue of the land claim boundary between the Dene/Métis and eastern arctic Inuit settlement areas. It is in this context that the issues of future constitutional development and division of the N.W.T. should be viewed.



In the N.W.T., a decade of negotiations on the status of the Eastern Arctic, and Inuit proposals for their own territory, resulted in a tentative agreement in principle between the Tungavik Federation of Nunavut (TFN) and the federal and N.W.T. governments in December 1989. The full agreement on Canada's largest land claim was signed in Igloolik on 30 April 1990. It involved land title to 350,000 square kilometres of the N.W.T., cash compensation of \$580 million (1989 dollars) over 14 years, and many complex joint management provisions. A final agreement was expected in 18 months.

On 5 September 1988, the Prime Minister signed an agreement in principle with the Dene and Métis of the Western Arctic, giving them ownership and subsurface mineral rights to 10,000 square kilometres of land; \$500 million in cash compensation to be paid over 20 years beginning in 1990; and special rights in an additional 180,000 square kilometres of land including a voice in land, wildlife and water management decisions. Aboriginal title and self-government were not included in the agreement. They were to be negotiated between native leaders and the government over the next several years. Although a 31 March 1990 deadline was missed, negotiations continued and a final agreement, based on the agreement in principle, was initialled on 9 April 1990. Ratification and signature by the two governments and the Dene-Métis were expected by 31 March 1991. However, the tentative agreement unravelled in the face of deep divisions among native groups. The federal government announced it would henceforth attempt to negotiate separate settlements.

Continuing tensions between the Inuit and the Dene over the western boundary of the Inuit land claim resurfaced in June 1991. Dene Nation leaders voiced strong objection to a federal proposal that would push the boundary west into contested areas of Contwoyto Lake in the central Arctic. The proposal was developed in response to Inuit objections to a boundary line proposed by an arbitrator in April. The boundary, when established, will provide the basis for dividing the territories into two separate political jurisdictions.

The political sensitivity of land claims was apparent, as well, on 13 July 1991, following federal announcement of an agreement with the Gwich'in band. The agreement, which would give the band 22,291 sq. km of Crown land in the Northwest Territories and 1,548 sq. km of Crown land in the Yukon, drew strong criticism from Yukon Premier Tony Penikett as representing "the worst kind of colonialism." Federal officials countered that the Yukon had

participated fully in negotiations, but had been opposing a deal agreed to by the other parties. The agreement, which extinguishes all prior aboriginal title, was formally signed by representatives of the Gwich'in and the federal government on 22 April 1992.

On 29 November 1991, representatives of the Yukon Indians, the Yukon government, and the federal government concluded a land claim and self-government agreement in principle. The agreement concluded negotiations which had continued, intermittently, since 1973 and had involved numerous frustrating setbacks. The land claim agreement gives aboriginals ownership of some 41,000 square kilometres, a \$232 million (1988 dollar) cash settlement, and a unique government buyout of \$30 million of on-reserve tax exemptions held by Indians.

Self-government powers, which are to be specified according to the requirements of individual First Nations, may include social services, education, economic development, and a limited system of tribal justice (involving paramountcy of the *Criminal Code*). The agreement subsequently went before the General Assembly of the Council for Yukon Indians and was ratified on 7 December 1991. Implementation negotiations, which were to have been completed by 15 September 1992, have been delayed by disagreements over cost estimates. In mid-December, the Yukon legislative assembly created a committee to review forthcoming implementation agreements; in early January 1993, negotiations were reported to be nearly completed. **As of this writing, it remains to be seen whether individual agreements can be approved by First Nations and the Yukon legislative assembly in time to go before the federal Cabinet in June, thus avoiding delays attendant upon a federal election.**

On 16 December 1991, an agreement-in-principle creating Nunavut -- a new territory in the eastern arctic -- was announced. The agreement required ratification by territorial residents and the Inuit people in plebiscites (see section 'C' below). It is a land claim agreement rather than an aboriginal self-government agreement, and makes no distinction between the status of the Inuit (now a majority in the area) and other groups with respect to the future government of the territory.

The agreement commits the government to establishing, over 14 years, a \$580 million Inuit trust fund, in return for gaining clear title to more than 80% of the approximately two million square kilometres claimed by the Inuit. The Inuit gain clear title to approximately

350,000 square kilometres, and hunting, fishing and trapping rights throughout Nunavut. While it was praised by Inuit representatives, the deal drew immediate criticism from representatives of the Dene Indians of Saskatchewan, Manitoba and the Northwest Territories, who claimed it disregarded their traditional use of parts of the new territory. **Attempts by the Dene to delay the settlement in the courts have thus far been unsuccessful, and a February 1993 motion by the House Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs calling for delay was rejected by Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs, the Hon. Tom Siddon. During a mid-March appearance before the Committee, he argued that the settlement will enable native groups outside Nunavut to negotiate access to traditional hunting grounds, and expressed the government's intention to have implementing legislation passed before the end of June.**

B. Provincial Status

The issue of provincial status for the territories has sparked considerable debate in recent years, and particularly so in light of the 1987 Meech Lake Accord which provided that admission of future provinces into Confederation would require unanimous approval of the existing provinces and the federal government. Territorial governments, opposition members and lobby groups were united in their opposition to this new barrier to possible future provincial status. They voiced their opposition loudly to the Senate Task Force on the Constitutional Accord during its hearings in Whitehorse, Yellowknife and Iqaluit in the fall of 1987, as they had done at the hearings of the Special Joint Committee on the Constitutional Accord during the summer. Early in 1989 several northern leaders journeyed as far as New Brunswick to reiterate their unhappiness with Meech Lake before a committee of that province's legislature. In October 1989, special committees of both the New Brunswick and Manitoba legislatures released reports recommending changes to the Meech Lake Accord which would, *inter alia*, meet the concerns expressed by Northerners. These concerns were reiterated in April and May 1990, during a new round of federal hearings by a special House of Commons committee on the New Brunswick companion resolution to the Meech Lake Accord. The report of that committee (the Charest report) recommended changes to accommodate northern concerns.

Both territorial governments also launched court challenges to the 1987 Accord. The Yukon government received a favourable preliminary ruling from the Yukon Supreme Court in August 1987. The Yukon Court of Appeal (which is actually the British Columbia Court of Appeal, sitting in Vancouver) overturned that ruling. The N.W.T. challenge was approved by the N.W.T. Supreme Court in December 1987. Ottawa's appeal, which was heard in Edmonton, resulted in rejection of the N.W.T. lawsuit by the Court of Appeal on 28 January 1988. In June 1988 the Supreme Court refused to hear an appeal by the territorial governments, putting an end to any solution to the issue in the courts.

The bitter reaction of all parties and sectors of the communities of the north to a severe barrier to future provincehood was understandable. There has been considerable debate, however, over the desirability of provincial status for the territories. The arguments against provincehood are simple and straightforward:

- The territories have very small populations and a small resource base available for taxation.
- The territories, under the present equalization formula, would not qualify for equalization grants but, on the other hand, would require substantial subsidization from the federal government because of their high operating costs. If they became provinces, they would require special treatment in equalization unless provincial status was delayed until megaproject developments in the north provided a better tax base and larger population.
- The entry of the territories as provinces would impact upon the importance of existing provinces under the constitutional amending formula, which requires agreement of the federal government and of two-thirds of the provinces representing at least 50% of the Canadian population.

On the other hand, there are equally straightforward arguments in favour of promoting provincial status for the north:

- Northerners are people too; it is time to end colonial domination and second-class status.

- Prince Edward Island, which also has a small population and tax base, already has a potential veto over future provincial status of the territories (under the Accord).
- The financial issue is fallacious - the territories do indeed currently need substantial subsidies from the federal government to meet operating expenses and provide services, but they are also currently receiving those subsidies; their continuing to receive subsidies from the federal ~~government under the rubric of equalization should not be~~ offensive to the provinces, as they would not be paying them (except in the sense that their taxpayers pay federal taxes, which they would continue to do).
- The territories already effectively exercise most of the powers of provincial governments, though without the requisite constitutional authority.
- The constitutional amendment provision concerning provinces with "at least 50% of the population of Canada" could hardly be affected by the addition of provinces with, in total, less than 1% of the population.

While these are the polar positions in the dispute, a balanced view should reflect several realistic concerns. First, it is not at all clear that the citizens of the territories want provincehood. Native groups want to settle the issues of land claims and self-government before considering whether provincehood would be preferable to other self-government structures. White communities are divided on the question of their readiness, especially economic readiness, for provincial status, though the Yukon white population is more in favour of it than that of the N.W.T. Without substantial megaproject development, changes to the equalization formula, or some constitutionally-entrenched special economic status for the north (inevitably resisted by the south), it is very unlikely that the northern provinces could afford to continue to provide current levels of governmental service.

Provincial status need not be viewed as an either/or question. It is possible for the territories to continue to develop towards provincial status, gradually assuming more powers and responsibilities from the federal government as they are ready and willing to do so. Resolutions of land claims and self-government issues can serve as steps along that road. The two territories - or three if the N.W.T. should be divided - may take different forks on that

road, and probably should, since they do differ. But southern efforts to establish roadblocks, such as the provisions of the 1987 Constitutional Accord, will inevitably be met with northern resistance.

Territorial government leaders are concerned that they not be left out of constitutional negotiations in the wake of Meech Lake's failure. The position that the territories must be full participants at the constitutional table, with the power to approve or veto any changes to their status, was put before the special joint Senate-House of Commons committee studying the amendment process during its hearings in the North in March 1991.

The Committee report, presented to both Houses of Parliament on 20 June 1991, recommended both that territorial governments be invited to participate in future constitutional discussions, and that they be given a right of consent over the extension of provincial boundaries into the territories, or the creation of new provinces in the territories.

Movement towards provincial status in the intergovernmental arena was apparent on 13 May 1991 when, for the first time, leaders of both territorial governments were included, with full participation rights, in the conference of western premiers. On 25-27 August, another first - the presence of the territorial government leaders at the annual conference of provincial premiers - provided further evidence of the evolving status of territorial governments. A further illustration of this trend was the inclusion of territorial representatives in the round of intergovernmental constitutional talks that followed the 28 February 1992 release of the report of the Special Joint Committee on a Renewed Canada. Furthermore, in the final product of these talks - the 28 August Charlottetown agreement - First Ministers indicated their readiness to reduce existing constitutional barriers to territories' acquisition of provincial status.

C. Division of the N.W.T.

Division of the N.W.T. has been an issue since the early 1960s. The inhabitants of the Mackenzie Delta proposed division in that period because they felt their political development was being delayed by a low level of political sophistication in the eastern arctic. The Carrothers Commission recommended against the division, however, to avoid slowing down development in the eastern arctic.



The issue arose again in the late 1970s, with a proposal by the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada for creation of a new territory, Nunavut, approximating the area above the tree line. Nunavut would have a government with powers similar to those of the present N.W.T., but with additional powers over land-use planning and control. Because Inuit would comprise approximately 80% of the population of Nunavut, creation of the new territory would, in effect, establish self-government for the Inuit.

The initial federal government response was the Drury Report, the Report of the Special Representative on Constitutional Development in the Northwest Territories. Commissioned at the request of the Prime Minister and released on 6 March 1980, the report recommended further study by the government and peoples of the N.W.T. of the consequences of any decision to divide the territory and drew attention to the connection between territorial division and land claims settlements.

In 1980, the Legislative Assembly of the N.W.T. gave approval in principle to division of the territory. Two years later, a territorial plebiscite was held on the issue. A majority of the voters, 56%, supported division, but that included 82% support in the eastern arctic; turnout in the western part of the territory was very low and considerably less favourable. Given majority support in the N.W.T., however, in November 1982 the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development announced approval in principle for the creation of Nunavut. Ottawa also established two regional constitutional groups to work on agreement on the division process: the Nunavut Constitutional Forum (NCF), predominantly Inuit, in the eastern arctic, and the Western Constitutional Forum (WCF) -- mixed Dene, Métis and white -- in the western arctic.

The federal government's approval in principle of division was subject to four conditions, all of which would have to be met before action would be taken:

- The boundary of Nunavut must be agreed upon by the people of the N.W.T.
- All of the people of the N.W.T. must support the division.
- Native claims in the N.W.T. must be settled before division.

- There must be agreement on the appropriate distribution of authority among local, regional and territorial governments.

These conditions raised numerous problems in subsequent years of negotiations between the NCF and WCF. Their initial boundary proposals differed sharply because of their disparate perceptions of traditional land-use patterns, communication and transportation links, and economic viability. The most bitterly-disputed area was access to the Beaufort Sea and its potential oil development. There were also problems with overlapping land claims. In addition, the Inuvialuit people of the western arctic, inhabiting the communities on the Beaufort Sea, desired some recognition of their unique status and political autonomy through creation of a Western Arctic Regional Municipality (WARM). A two-fold issue is therefore created: what would be the powers of WARM and should it be included in Nunavut or in the western territory, Denendeh?

The attraction of the Nunavut proposal for the Inuit people of the eastern arctic is obvious. It gives them effective political control of their homeland. The proposal, however, was criticized for several possible undesirable consequences:

- Nunavut might not achieve the goal of creating a pan-Inuit homeland. The Inuvialuit of the western arctic have clear ties to the Mackenzie Valley and might well opt to include WARM in Denendeh rather than Nunavut.
- The present strength of the N.W.T.'s native peoples, which allows them collectively to control a majority in the N.W.T. Assembly, would be fragmented. Native peoples would be a minority in Denendeh.
- Two smaller, less populous territories would be weaker in their dealings with Ottawa and the southern provinces.
- Government would be more costly and less efficient and northern public administration less effective.

Because of these problems, the discussions, negotiations and debate between the NCF and WCF continued for almost five years. Finally, in January 1987, the Dene and Inuit negotiators reached an agreement to divide the N.W.T., and the Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs announced his support for the agreement. The NCF and WCF planned a new

referendum on division for the spring of 1987. Further talks to settle the boundary line broke down, however, over the area around the Manitoba-Saskatchewan border and the issue of development of mineral resources on the east arm of Great Slave Lake, where land claims overlap. The referendum was never held.

The period since 1987 has seen continued attempts to resolve the boundary issue by negotiation. In January 1989, however, in response to continuing deadlock, the Tungavik Federation of Nunavut requested arbitration of the dispute; this launched the series of events culminating in the recent federal proposal discussed in Section A above.

The Nunavut claim agreement signed on 30 April 1990 provided that within six months the Inuit and the N.W.T. government would develop a political process to create the new territory and its government outside of the claims process. Subsequently, the government of the Northwest Territories moved to expedite the creation of a new territory in the western arctic. On 6 June 1991, a five-member commission (expanded to six members with the 8 July addition of a women's representative) was established to study the constitutional future of the western Northwest Territories.

The 16 December agreement (see section 'A' above) settling the land claim of the Inuit in the eastern arctic provides for the division of the Northwest Territories into two territories: a new eastern territory of Nunavut and the rest of the Northwest Territories, to be re-named. The agreement now requires ratification by residents of the Northwest Territories generally, and by the Inuit, in separate plebiscites.

In the territorial plebiscite on the proposed boundary between Nunavut and the rest of the Northwest Territories, held on 4 May 1992, the boundary proposal was accepted. The vote was close, with only about 54% voting in favour, and reflected divisions between the West (where about 75% opposed the boundary) and the East (where about 90% voted in favour). A high voter turnout in the East enabled this vote to determine the outcome in the territory as a whole. While the vote is not binding, it enables the federal government and that of the Northwest Territories to proceed with legislation to implement the division of the Territories. A further plebiscite, in which Inuit voters responded to the Nunavut land claim settlement, took place on 3-5 November 1992. The land claim agreement was approved by a vote of 69%,

giving the green light to the broader project of territorial division. (For recent developments relating to the land claim agreement, see p. 7 above.)

PARLIAMENTARY ACTION

In October 1983, the Special Committee of the House of Commons on Indian Self-Government in Canada noted in its Report that the situation of native peoples in the territories was very different from that which prevailed in the provinces. The Committee also observed the links between land claims, aboriginal self-government, and ongoing discussions of the constitutional status of the territories.

In October 1987, the House of Commons voted in favour of the resolution on the 1987 Constitutional Accord. In October and November, the Senate Task Force on the Constitutional Accord held hearings in Whitehorse, Yellowknife and Iqaluit. In February 1988, the task force tabled its report in the Senate. The Liberal members of the task force, constituting the majority, unanimously supported the recommendations in the report and the Conservative members unanimously dissented. Those recommendations were that:

- the provisions of the Constitutional Accord which give the provinces a say in appointments to the Senate and the Supreme Court should also be extended to the territorial governments;
- the Accord should be amended to require that representatives of the territorial governments be invited to participate at all future constitutional conferences on the constitution and on the economy;
- any change in boundaries between the provinces and territories must have the consent of the territory concerned;
- attainment of provincial status by the territories should be subject only to the approval of the federal government and the territory concerned;
- aboriginal and treaty rights and the issue of self-government should be added as continuing items to the agenda of future constitutional conferences;

- aboriginal peoples of Canada should be recognized as constituting distinct societies.

On 21 April 1988, the Senate returned the constitutional resolution on the Meech Lake Accord to the House of Commons with amendments which included all those recommended by the Senate Task Force. The Senate has no veto power over constitutional amendments, however, and the Accord received parliamentary approval when the House of Commons passed the resolution once again in its original form on 22 June 1988. When the issue was re-opened in the Commons, northern concerns received favourable consideration in the Charest committee's May 1990 report on a proposed companion resolution to Meech Lake. But, with the ultimate failure of the process to ratify the Accord in June 1990, the situation has reverted to the constitutional status quo of 1982.

On 20 June 1991, the Special Joint Committee on the Procedure for Amending the Constitution of Canada recommended that territorial governments be invited to participate in future constitutional discussions, and that territorial governments be given a right of consent over the extension of provincial boundaries into the territories or the creation of new provinces in the territories.

CHRONOLOGY

- | | |
|------|--|
| 1881 | - Fully-elected assembly in N.W.T. |
| 1897 | - Responsible government in N.W.T. |
| 1898 | - Yukon established as a separate territory. |
| 1905 | - Alberta and Saskatchewan separated from N.W.T. and made provinces. The rest of the N.W.T. reverted to colonial status ruled by a commissioner and public servants in Ottawa. |
| 1908 | - Fully-elected council in Yukon. |
| 1921 | - A six-member council, based in Ottawa, appointed to advise the N.W.T. commissioner. |

- 1951
 - First session of N.W.T. council held in the territory with some elected members.
 - The "Carrothers Commission," an Advisory Commission on the Development of Government in the N.W.T., was established.
- 1966
 - In the N.W.T., the first three elected eastern arctic ridings were created.
- 1967
 - ~~As recommended by the Carrothers Commission, the N.W.T. Council was~~ increased to 16 members, some elected and some appointed, and the territorial government was moved to Yellowknife.
- 1975
 - First fully-elected N.W.T. Legislative Assembly.
- 1978
 - Party politics introduced in Yukon elections.
- 1979
 - The Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs instructed the Yukon Commissioner to appoint a Cabinet on the advice of the Government Leader and to act on its advice.
- 1970s
 - The Inuit Tapirisat of Canada raised the issue of division of the N.W.T. into Nunavut and Denendeh.
- 1980
 - The "Drury Report," the Report of the Special Representative on Constitutional Development in the Northwest Territories, recommended further study of the consequences of division of the N.W.T. and drew attention to the connection with land claims negotiations.
- 1982
 - The Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development announced approval in principle for the creation of Nunavut. Ottawa established funding for two regional groupings to work on agreement on the details of division: the Nunavut Constitutional Forum and the Western Constitutional Forum.
 - A referendum was held in the N.W.T. on division of the territory. Overall, division was supported by 56% of the voters, but that included 82% support in the eastern arctic (Nunavut) and much lower support for division in the proposed Denendeh territory, where turnout was also very low.
- 1987
 - The NCF and WCF agreed in principle on division of the N.W.T. and the agreement was supported by the Minister. No agreement could be reached on resolution of the boundary. The proposed 1987 referendum on division had yet to be scheduled.

- The Meech Lake Constitutional Accord included provisions which would inhibit future acquisition of provincial status for the Yukon and Northwest Territories. The Accord also provided for a provincial say in Senate and Supreme Court appointments but gave no such voice to the territories.

1988

- In February the Senate Task Force on the Meech Lake Constitutional Accord and the Yukon and Northwest Territories tabled its report, recommending substantial changes to the Accord to redress the grievances expressed by ~~northern and aboriginal peoples.~~
- On 21 April the Senate returned the resolution on the Constitutional Accord to the House of Commons with amendments which incorporated the recommendations of the northern task force.
- During the spring the N.W.T. government reconstituted the NCF and WCF as one integrated constitutional forum with interim funding.
- On 22 June the House of Commons voted a second time in favour of the resolution as originally formulated, resulting in parliamentary approval of the Meech Lake Accord without including any of the Senate amendments.
- On 2 June the Supreme Court refused to hear the territories' appeal on the validity of the Meech Lake Accord.
- On 2 August 1988 Indian and Northern Affairs Canada released "A Northern Political and Economic Framework." The policy statement affirms the goals of establishing fully responsible northern governments, settling land claims, and promoting economic development.
- On September 5 the Prime Minister signed an agreement in principle with the Dene and Métis of the N.W.T. on a land claims settlement.
- On 6 and 22 September, Ottawa signed energy agreements in principle with the N.W.T. and the Yukon respectively.

1989

- On 30 January the TFN asked for binding arbitration to define the land claim boundary with the Dene/Métis
- On 16 March the federal Cabinet ratified the Yukon land claim framework agreement.
- On 2 October the first native Commissioner of the N.W.T. was sworn in.

- On 8 December an agreement in principle was reached on the Inuit land claim, the largest in Canada.
- 1990
- On 31 March an agreement in principle was reached on the Yukon claim.
 - On 9 April a final agreement was initialled on the Dene-Métis claim.
 - The Nunavut claim agreement was signed on 30 April.
 - The Charest Committee recommended changes to accommodate northern constitutional concerns, but the Meech Lake Accord died when it was not ratified by the deadline of 23 June.
 - The collapse of the Dene-Métis agreement and the Oka crisis raised the political stakes in the land claims process in the North.
- 1991
- Northern leaders insisted on full participation in any constitutional negotiations.
 - In June, the announcement of a federal proposal for the western boundary of the Inuit land claim (which could provide the basis for territorial division) drew protest from Dene leaders.
 - On 20 June, the Special Joint Committee on the Procedure for Amending the Constitution of Canada recommended enhancement of the role of the territories in constitutional change.
 - On 13 July, an agreement was reached on the Gwich'in land claim.
 - On 29 November, a land claim and self-government agreement was reached between the Yukon Indians and the federal and territorial governments.
 - On 7 December, the General Assembly of the Council for Yukon Indians ratified the 29 November land claim and self-government agreement.
 - On 16 December, a land claim agreement was reached between the Inuit of the eastern arctic, and the federal and territorial governments. If ratified, it will create the new territory of Nunavut.
- 1992
- On 12 April, the Gwich'in agreement was formally signed by representatives of the Gwich'in and the federal government.
 - On 4 May, Northwest Territories voters narrowly approved the boundary proposed in the Nunavut land claim agreement.

- In a 3-5 November plebiscite, 69% of Inuit voters approved the Nunavut land claim agreement.

SELECTED REFERENCES

- Abele, Frances. "Canadian Contradictions: Forty Years of Northern Political Development." *Arctic*, Vol. 40, No. 4, December 1987, p. 310-320.
- Dacks, Gurston. *A Choice of Futures: Politics in the Canadian North*. Methuen, Toronto, 1981.
- Dacks, Gurston. "The Case Against Dividing the Northwest Territories." *Canadian Public Policy*, XII(1), 1986, p. 202-213.
- Dacks, Gurston. "Politics on the Last Frontier: Consociationalism in the Northwest Territories." *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, XIX(2), June 1986, p. 345-361.
- Dacks, Gurston. ed. *Devolution and Constitutional Development in the Canadian North*. Carleton University Press, Ottawa, 1990.
- Dene Nation and Metis Association of the Northwest Territories. *Devolution of Powers to the Government of the Northwest Territories: Provincehood and Self-Government*. 11th Legislative Assembly of the Northwest Territories, Tabled Document No. 51-88(2), November 1988.
- Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Task Force to Review Comprehensive Claims Policy. "Living Treaties: Lasting Agreements." 1986.
- Drury, C.M. "Constitutional Development in the Northwest Territories." *Report of the Special Representative, Minister of Supply and Services Canada*, Ottawa, 1979.
- Jull, Peter. "How Self-Government Must Come." *Policy Options*, July 1987.
- Nerysoo, Richard. "Provincehood When?" *Canadian Parliamentary Review*, Winter 1989-90, p. 7-8.
- Nunavut Constitutional Forum. "Building Nunavut: A Discussion Paper Containing Proposals for an Arctic Constitution." Nunavut Constitutional Forum, 1983.
- Page, Robert. *Northern Development: The Canadian Dilemma*. McClelland and Stewart, Toronto, 1986.

Robertson, Gordon. *Northern Provinces: A Mistaken Goal*. Institute for Research on Public Policy, Montreal, 1985.

The Senate of Canada. Report of the Task Force on the Meech Lake Constitutional Accord and on the Yukon and the Northwest Territories. Ottawa, February 1988.

Western Constitutional Forum. *Partners for the Future: A Selection of Papers Related to Constitutional Development in the Western Northwest Territories*. Western Constitutional Forum, Yellowknife, 1985.

Whittington, Michael S., coordinator. *The North*. Volume 72, Research Studies of the Royal Commission on the Economic Union and Development Prospects for Canada. University of Toronto Press, Toronto, 1985.



ACCO®

ACCOPRESS™



YELLOW	25070	JAUNE
BLACK	25071	NOIR
BLUE	25072	BLEU
RL. BLUE	25073	RL. BLEU
GREY	25074	GRIS
GREEN	25075	VERT
RUST	25078	ROUILLE
EX RED	25079	ROUGE

ACCO CANADA INC.
WILLOWDALE, ONTARIO

* INDICATES
75% RECYCLED
25% POST-
CONSUMER FIBRE



*SIGNIFIE 75 %
FIBRES RECYCLÉES,
25 % DÉCHETS DE
CONSOMMATION

BALANCE OF PRODUCTS
25% RECYCLED

AUTRES PRODUITS:
25 % FIBRES RECYCLÉES

